DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 279 TM 810 773

AUTHOR Harmon, David J.
TITLE Intensive Communication Strategy: The Gifted Program. Evaluation Report. Research and Evaluation Bulletin.
INSTITUTION Kanawha County Schools, Charleston, W. Va.
REPORT NO KCS-TR-5
PUB DATE 13 Aug 80
NOTE 53p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; *Organizational Communication; Program Evaluation; *Special Programs; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of building level principals and teachers are crucial to the successful implementation of any program or project. This input evaluation was conducted to assess the effect of an intensive communication strategy on teacher/principal: (1) attitude toward the gifted program; (2) knowledge of the characteristics of gifted students; (3) attitude toward program and school staff communication; and (4) attitude toward the curriculum of the Gifted Program. This effort was implemented at nine schools (elementary and secondary) by teachers of the gifted. The strategy included presentations at faculty meetings, conferences with individual teachers and department chairpersons, and availability to serve on School Based Assistance Teams. This is not an overall evaluation of the gifted program, but only an assessment of the aforementioned strategy. The results of this study seem to support the following conclusions: there is some evidence that the strategy improved attitudes toward the gifted program at the junior high level and the senior high level, overall, the strategy improved attitudes toward program to school staff communication; and the strategy improved attitudes toward the curriculum for gifted students at the elementary level. (Author/GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209279

Research and Evaluation Bulletin

INTENSIVE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D J Harmon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 810 773

Kanawha County Schools

Department of Research and Evaluation

INTENSIVE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY:

THE GIFTED PROGRAM

EVALUATION REPORT

PREPARED BY

Dr. David J. Harmon

Coordinator of Research and Evaluation

August 13, 1980

Kanawha County Schools
Department of
Research and Evaluation
Dr. Catherine C. Chandler, Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project staff and I sincerely appreciate the participation of the principals and teachers at the following schools:

1. Experimental Group

Oakwood Elementary
Marmet Elementary
Piedmont Elementary
Marmet Junior High
Roosevelt Junior High
John Adams Junior High
East Bank High
Charleston High
George Washington High

2. Control Group

Belle Elementary
Overbrook Elementary
Kanawha City Elementary
Lincoln Junior High
Hayes Junior High
DuPont Junior High
Stonewall Jackson High
DuPont High
St. Albans High

I am also very grateful to Ruth H. Yarbrough, who typed this document and computed all t-tests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	METHODOLOGY	2
	Subjects and Sampling	2
	Instrumentation	2
	Data Gathering and Analysis	3
III.	RESULTS	5
	Attitude Toward the Gifted Program	5
	Characteristics of Gifted Students	8
	Communication (Program to School Staff)	11
	Curriculum for the Gifted Program	15
	Summary of Significant Findings	19
IV.	DISCUSSION	20
	Summary of Results	20
	Conclusions	21
	Implications	22
Appendix		
	A. Gifted Program Assessment	23
	B. Attitude Toward the Gifted Program	30
	C. Characteristics of Gifted Students	35
	D. Communication (Program to School Staff)	40
	E. Curriculum for the Gifted Program	44

LIST OF TABLES IN THE TEXT

Table		Page
1.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward the Gifted Program by Groups (Elementary Level)	6
2.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward the Gifted Program by Groups (Junior High Level)	7
3.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward the Gifted Program by Groups (Senior High Level)	8
4.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Knowledge of Characteristics of Gifted Students by Groups (Elementary Level)	9
5.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Knowledge of Characteristics of Gifted Students by Groups (Junior High Level)	10
6.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Knowledge of Characteristics of Gifted Students by Groups (Senior High Level)	11
7.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Communication by Groups (Elementary Level)	12
8.	Analysis of Variance of Attitude Toward Communication Posttest Scores by Groups (Elementary Level)	12
9.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Communication by Groups (Junior High Level)	13
10.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Communication by Groups (Senior High Level)	14
11.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward Curriculum by Groups (Elementary Level)	15
12.	Analysis of Variance of Posttest Scores for Attitude Toward the Curriculum by Groups (Elementary Level)	16
13.	Analysis of Variance for Attitude Toward Curriculum by Groups and Tests (Elementary Level)	16
14.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward Curriculum by Groups (Junior High Level)	17
15.	Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for Attitude Toward Curriculum by Groups (Senior High Level)	18
16.	Significant Findings	19

INTRODUCTION

The attitudes of building level principals and teachers are crucial to the successful implementation of any program or project. This input evaluation was conducted to assess the effect of an intensive communication strategy on teacher/principal: (1) attitude toward the Gifted Program; (2) knowledge of the characteristics of gifted students; (3) attitude toward program and school staff communication; and (4) attitude toward the curriculum of the Gifted Program. This effort was implemented at nine schools from November, 1979 through April, 1980 by teachers of the gifted. The strategy included: (1) three 30 minute presentations at faculty meetings; (2) conferences with individual teachers and department chairpersons and (3) availability to serve on School Based Assistance Teams. This is not an overall evaluation of the Gifted Program, but only an assessment of the aforementioned strategy. If this strategy results in improved attitudes toward the Gifted Program and increased knowledge of gifted students, then the success of the continued implementation of the Gifted Program should improve. This assumption provided the impetus for this pilot study.

The Director of Exceptional Children is the principle level of decision-making being served by this study. The decision alternatives are: (1) continue the strategy at other schools; (2) modify the strategy and continue implementation at other schools and (3) terminate the strategy. Implications regarding the alternatives are discussed in the final narrative section of this document.

METHODOLOGY

This section includes a discussion of the following topics: (1) subjects and sampling; (2) instrumentation and (3) data gathering and analysis. Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation design will be alluded to within each subsection.

Subjects and Sampling

Three senior high schools with three feeder junior highs and three feeder elementary schools were selected by the program staff to receive the intensive communication strategy. Selection involved one urban, one suburban and one rural area. A control school (no intervention) from a similar geographic area was matched with each of the nine experimental schools. Comparability of groups prior to intervention was assessed with pretest data. When significant pretest differences were identified in the means for the experimental and control groups, posttest comparisons were considered invalid.

Instrumentation

The Gifted Program Assessment (GPA) consists of four subscales: (1) general attitude toward the gifted program; (2) characteristics of gifted students; (3) communication (i.e., program staff with school staff); and (4) curriculum for the gifted program. Each subscale was developed in a semantic differential format to facilitate the measurement of attitudes (Appendix A). The bi-polar terms for each subscale were generated by the teachers of the gifted during the August 28, 1979 inservice meeting under the direction of this evaluator. The development procedure supports the content validity of the instrument.

The GPA was piloted at a rural junior high school during September and October, 1979. The focus of the pilot test was instrument stability and administration time. Two administrations of the GPA were conducted at a one month interval. The results were correlated as an assessment of test-retest reliability (stability). The reliability coefficients for the subscales were: (1) .87 for the characteristics of gifted students and curriculum for the gifted program; (2) .86 for the general attitude toward the gifted program and (3) .68 for communication.

Instrument length and teacher/principal unfamiliarity with the use of semantic differential scales were impediments. Additionally, some teachers thought that subscale #2 (characteristics of gifted students) was an attempt to categorize students rather than allow for individual differences among gifted students. Common misconceptions as well as generally accurate statements were included to assess staff knowledge of the characteristics of gifted students.

Data Gathering and Analysis

The Gifted Program Assessment was administered as a pretest and posttest to the staff members of both the experimental and control schools. Members of the program staff administered the GPA at the experimental schools. Principals were responsible for instrument administration at the control schools. Unfortunately, the time of the posttest administration corresponded with the teacher walkout. Hence, the return rate was reduced. Only respondents with a completed pretest and posttest were included in the analyses. The GPA was hand-scored by the Department of Research and Evaluation.

In order to test the effects of the intensive communication strategy, the following analyses were performed: (1) t-test of related samples with the experimental group pretest and posttest data; (2) t-test of related samples with the control group pretest and posttest data; (3) one-way analysis of variance with the experimental and control group pretest data; and (4) one-way analysis of variance with the experimental and control group posttest data. The analyses were performed with data from each of the four subscales at the elementary, junior and senior high levels. Additionally, the elementary school data were analyzed using a one between-one within-subjects design. The group (experimental-control) by tests (pretest-posttest) interaction was of interest in this computation.

RESULTS

This section includes four major subsections corresponding to the four subscales of the Gifted Program Assessment. Relevant findings for the elementary, junior and senior high levels are provided within each subsection. Analysis of variance summary tables yielding nonsignificant differences and/or suggesting invalid comparisons are provided by subscale in Appendices B-E. For the purposes of this study, an invalid comparison is a posttest comparison (experimental-control group) when significant pretest differences were identified. Significant differences between the pretest and posttest means for the control group would reduce the credibility of the experimental group pretest-posttest comparison. Fortunately, no significant gains were obtained with the control group data. A summary of all significant results is provided at the conclusion of this section.

Attitude Toward the Gifted Program

Elementary School. Overall analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test findings are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 1.

TABLE 1

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences(C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	122.44	111.33	11.11
SD	19.60	23.42	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	127.44	115.61	11.83
SD	20.40	24.16	
Differences(B-A)	5.0	4.28	

Table 1 indicates no significant ($p \leq 0.10$) differences between the: (1) pretest and posttest means for the experimental group; (2) pretest and posttest means for the control group; (3) experimental and control group pretest means; and (4) experimental and control group posttest means. Hence, there is no support for strategy effectiveness in improving the attitude of elementary staff members toward the gifted program. Analysis of variance summary tables are provided in Appendix B.

Junior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test findings are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 2.

TABLE 2

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental (C)	Control (D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest (A)			
Mean	95.39	73.50	21.89*
SD	21.49	27.66	
ANOVA			
Posttest (B)			
Mean	101.34	75.08	26.26*
SD	19.67	26.86	
Differences (B-A)	5.95**	1.58	

*$p \leq 0.01$
**$p \leq 0.05$

Table 2 indicates a significant ($p \leq 0.05$) attitude improvement with the experimental group and not with the control group. These findings provide some support for strategy effectiveness. The posttest comparison between the experimental and control group is considered invalid due to significant ($p \leq 0.01$) pretest differences. Summary tables for each ANOVA are presented in Appendix B.

Senior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 3.

TABLE 3

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	106.14	118.57	-12.43
SD	20.08	14.15	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	111.86	107.29	4.57
SD	20.40	16.26	
Differences(B-A)	5.72*	-11.28	

*$p \leq 0.10$

Table 3 suggests that the attitude of the experimental group significantly ($p \leq 0.10$) improved as a result of the strategy. Other comparisons yielded no significant differences. Summary tables for each ANOVA are provided in Appendix B.

Characteristics of Gifted Students

Elementary School. Overall ANOVA and t-test findings are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 4.

TABLE 4

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD)
FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED
STUDENTS BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	181.00	198.25	-17.24*
SD	24.17	23.92	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	187.94	191 65	-3.71
SD	19.63	14.89	
Differences(B-A)	6.94	-6.59	

*$p \leq 0.10$

Inspection of Table 4 indicates no significant ($p \leq 0.10$) differences between the pretest and posttest means for either the experimental or control group. These findings provide no support for strategy effectiveness. The experimental-control group posttest comparison is considered invalid due to significant ($p \leq 0.10$) pretest differences. Appendix C includes the ANOVA summary tables.

Junior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 5.

TABLE 5

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD)
FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF
GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	165.31	172.18	-6.87
SD	31.35	22.73	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	168.15	165.27	2.88
SD	27.62	36.10	
Differences(B-A)	2.84	-6.91	

Table 5 indicates no significant ($p \leq 0.10$) differences between the: (1) pretest and posttest means for the experimental group; (2) pretest and posttest means for the control group; (3) experimental and control group pretest means; and (4) experimental and control group posttest means. Hence, there is no support for strategy effectiveness in increasing the knowledge of junior high school staff members concerning characteristics of gifted students. Analysis of variance summary tables are presented in Appendix C.

Senior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 6.

TABLE 6

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental (C)	Control (D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest (A)			
Mean	182.81	176.75	4.06
SD	17.29	22.78	
ANOVA			
Posttest (B)			
Mean	181.29	180.75	0.54
SD	19.83	18.37	
Differences (B-A)	-1.52	2.00	

Table 6 indicates no significant ($p \leq 0.10$) differences between the: (1) pretest and posttest means for the experimental group; (2) pretest and posttest means for the control group; (3) experimental and control group pretest means; and (4) experimental and control group posttest means. There appears to be no support for strategy effectiveness with this criterion. Other ANOVA summary tables are provided in Appendix C.

Communication (Program to School Staff)

Elementary School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are presented with the means and standard deviations in Table 7.

TABLE 7

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	56.07	52.73	3.34
SD	15.19	13.96	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	64.13	56.33	7.78**
SD	11.47	12.32	
Differences(B-A)	8.06*	3.60	

*p ≤ 0.05
**p ≤ 0.10

The ANOVA for the posttest comparison is provided in Table 8.

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION POSTTEST SCORES BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	456.30	3.01*
Error (S/A)	28	151.82	
Total	29		

*p ≤ 0.10

The experimental group's attitude toward program staff to school staff communication significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) improved as a result of the strategy. Additional support for strategy effectiveness is provided by the significant ($p \leq 0.10$) difference between the experimental and control group posttest means. Appendix D includes other ANOVA summary tables.

Junior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are presented with the means and standard deviations in Table 9.

TABLE 9

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	44.03	34.73	9.30**
SD	8.35	12.64	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	48.90	35.27	13.63*
SD	8.83	15.67	
Differences(B-A)	4.87**	0.54	

*$p \leq 0.01$
**$p \leq 0.05$

Table 9 indicates a significant ($p \leq 0.05$) attitude improvement with the experimental group and not with the control group. These findings provide some

support for strategy effectiveness. The posttest comparison between the experimental and control group is considered invalid due to significant ($p \leq 0.05$) pretest differences. Summary tables for each ANOVA are provided in Appendix D.

Senior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are presented with the means and standard deviations in Table 10.

TABLE 10

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental (C)	Control (D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest (A)			
Mean	42.45	51.75	-9.30**
SD	12.76	13.00	
ANOVA			
Posttest (B)			
Mean	48.57	45.25	3.32
SD	10.53	8.45	
Differences (B-A)	6.12*	-6.50**	

*$p \leq 0.01$
**$p \leq 0.10$

Table 10 indicates a significant ($p \leq 0.01$) attitude improvement with the experimental group and not with the control group. These findings provide some support for strategy effectiveness. The posttest comparison between the

experimental and control group is considered invalid due to significant ($p \leq 0.10$) pretest differences. Appendix D includes summary tables for each ANOVA.

Curriculum for the Gifted Program

Elementary School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are noted with the means and standard deviations in Table 11.

TABLE 11

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

	Experimental (C)	Control (D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest (A)			
Mean	125.25	123.81	1.44
SD	24.38	26.78	
ANOVA			
Posttest (B)			
Mean	139.06	123.38	15.68**
SD	22.52	22.92	
Differences (B-A)	13.81*	-0.43	

*$p \leq 0.05$
**$p \leq 0.10$

The ANOVA for the posttest comparison is presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CURRICULUM BY GROUPS
(ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	1968.78	3.58*
Error (S/A)	30	550.76	
Total	31		

*p ≤ 0.10

The groups by tests interaction was investigated in a one between-one within-subjects design; see Table 13.

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD
CURRICULUM BY GROUPS AND TESTS
(ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Between Ss	31		
Exp/Control (A)	1	1,173.06	1.08
Error (S/A)	30	1,082.63	
Within Ss	32		
Tests (B)	1	715.56	4.27
Exp/Control x Tests (AB)	1	812.26	4.84*
Error (SB/A)	30	167.77	
Total	63		

*p ≤ 0.05

Each of the three methods of analysis provides strong support for the effectiveness of the intensive communication strategy. The results of the t-tests suggest that the attitude toward the gifted program curriculum significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) improved for the experimental group and not for the control group. Although there were no differences in the pretest means, the ANOVA indicated that the experimental group had significantly ($p \leq 0.10$) better posttest scores than the control group. The ANOVA summary table for the pretest comparison is presented in Appendix E.

Junior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are presented with the means and standard deviations in Table 14.

TABLE 14

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD)
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS
(JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental(C)	Control(D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest(A)			
Mean	107.64	87.00	20.64**
SD	23.56	26.67	
ANOVA			
Posttest(B)			
Mean	117.50	87.25	30.25*
SD	18.66	34.40	
Differences(B-A)	9.86**	0.25	

*$p \leq 0.01$
**$p \leq 0.05$

Inspection of Table 14 indicates a significant ($p \leq 0.05$) attitude improvement with the experimental group and not with the control group. These findings provide some support for the effectiveness of the strategy. The posttest comparison between the experimental and control group is considered invalid due to significant ($p \leq 0.05$) pretest differences. Appendix E includes the ANOVA summary tables.

Senior High School. Overall ANOVA and t-test results are listed with the means and standard deviations in Table 15.

TABLE 15

PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

	Experimental (C)	Control (D)	t-test Differences (C-D)
Pretest (A)			
Mean	114.83	115.00	-0.17
SD	21.77	20.61	
ANOVA			
Posttest (B)			
Mean	116.21	106.86	9.35
SD	20.06	18.78	
Differences (B-A)	1.38	-8.14	

Table 15 indicates no significant ($p \leq 0.10$) differences between the: (1) pretest and posttest means for the experimental group; (2) pretest and posttest

means for the control group; (3) experimental and control group pretest means; and (4) experimental and control group posttest means. Hence, there is no support for strategy effectiveness. Analysis of variance summary tables are provided in Appendix E.

Summary of Significant Findings

TABLE 16

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Comparison/Level	Tests of Significance
Attitude Toward the Gifted Program	
Junior High (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Senior High (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Communication (Project to School Staff)	
Elementary (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Posttest	Exp. > Control
Junior High (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Senior High (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Curriculum for the Gifted Students	
Elementary (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest
Posttest	Exp. > Control
Junior High (Exp. Group)	Post > Pretest

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to provide the Office of Exceptional Children with information concerning the effectiveness of an intensive communication strategy. Three decision alternatives were specified. Prior to presenting implications concerning the alternatives, this section will include a summary of results and conclusions.

Summary of Results

The findings indicate a significant improvement in attitude toward the Gifted Program among junior and senior high strategy participants. Improvement at the elementary school level was not sufficient to reach statistical significance.

The experimental group pretest-posttest comparisons with the knowledge of characteristics of gifted students subtest indicated no significant knowledge increase. These findings preclude serious consideration of the experimental-control group comparisons.

Although there was no support for strategy effectiveness with the aforementioned subtest, there is very strong support for positive strategy effects with the attitude toward communication subtest. At the elementary, junior and senior high levels, the attitude of the experimental group toward program to school staff communication significantly improved. In addition, the elementary school experimental group had a significantly higher posttest mean than the control group. This evidence suggests that the attitude

improvement of the experimental group would not have occurred without the intensive communication strategy. At the junior high level and senior high level, the posttest comparison between the experimental and control groups was considered invalid due to significant pretest differences.

The findings indicate a significant improvement in attitude toward the Gifted Program curriculum among the elementary and junior high experimental group members. Pretest and posttest differences for the senior high experimental group were not great enough to be considered statistically significant. At the elementary level, the experimental group had a significantly higher posttest mean than the control group. Hence, the reader should have greater confidence in the positive strategy effect at the elementary level. The posttest comparison at the junior high level was considered invalid due to significant pretest differences.

Conclusions

Generalizations from this study are limited by the accuracy of data interpretations and by population characteristics. The results of this study seem to support the following conclusions:

1. There is some evidence that the strategy improved attitudes toward the Gifted Program at the junior high level and the senior high level.

2. Overall, the strategy improved attitudes toward program to school staff communication.

3. The strategy improved attitudes toward the curriculum for gifted students at the elementary level.

4. There is some evidence that the strategy improved attitudes toward the curriculum for gifted students at the junior high level.

Implications

The information presented in this report should be considered in the context of: (1) insights gained by the teachers of the gifted during strategy implementation; (2) budget (cost-benefit analyses were not performed) and (3) feedback from principals and teachers. The findings of this study support the continuation of the intensive communciation strategy with some modification. The Gifted Program staff should analyze the strategy to identify the specific strategy components that could be modified to improve the: (1) general attitude toward the Gifted Program at the elementary level; (2) overall knowledge of the characteristics of gifted students and (3) attitude toward the Gifted Program curriculum at the senior high level. It should be noted that the suggestions were generated from the failure of the strategy to produce significant improvements, not from negative attitudes toward any aspect of the Gifted Program.

APPENDIX A

GIFTED PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Mrs. Alice Moore, President
Matthew M. Kinsolving Dr. Paul A. Leary
F. Douglas Stump Harry A. Wallace III

SUPERINTENDENT
Robert E. Kittle

Kanawha County Schools

200 ELIZABETH STREET · CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25311
TELEPHONE 304/348-7770

February 19, 1980

TO: Faculty and Administration of the Experimental and Control Group Schools

FROM: Dr. David J. Harmon, Coordinator
Research and Evaluation

SUBJECT: THE GIFTED PROGRAM

Your cooperation is requested in assessing attitudes toward the Gifted Program. As requested, most of the teachers and principals in the experimental and control schools completed the attached instrument during October, 1979. In order to assess changes in attitude, it is necessary for you to complete the survey once again. Insights gained from the October and March data will be used to improve the Gifted Program.

The nature of this assessment requires that you complete all biographic information including your name. However, your responses will be shared with no one. Completion of the instrument should require no more than 10 minutes. Upon completion, return the instrument to your principal. A rapid return rate will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, call Dr. David J. Harmon at 348-6115. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

CC

NAME_____

GIFTED PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Your reactions/responses to these items are being requested by the Department of Research and Evaluation to facilitate planning. Your individual responses will be revealed to no one. Please respond to each item with total honesty and objectivity.

FILL IN THE BLANKS for questions 1 - 8.

1. School Name _____

2. Your Highest Degree (circle one)
   BA MA MA+ Ph.D

3. Sex (circle one)
   M F

4. Number of Special Education Hours _____

5. Years of Teaching Experience _____Years

6. Position (circle one)
   Teacher Counselor Admin.

7. If teaching, at which grade level _____

8. If teaching, which discipline _____

QUICKLY [illegible]AD THE LIST OF BI-POLAR TERMS RELATED TO EACH CONCEPT/TOPIC, PLACE A CHECK MARK IN THE BLANK FOR EACH PAIR OF TERMS THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD THE CONCEPT/TOPIC.

FOR EXAMPLE:

MATHEMATICS (The Topic)
(Bi-polar Terms)

Exciting	___	✓	___	___	___	___	___	Dull
Bad	___	___	___	✓	___	___	___	Good

I. GIFTED PROGRAM

Necessary	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unnecessary
Negative	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Positive
Interesting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Dull
Ordinary	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unique
Challenging	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Routine
Worthless	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Valuable
Appropriate for students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Inappropriate for students
Chaotic	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Organized
Committed	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Apathetic
Hindrance	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Helpful

I. Gifted Program (Continued)

Established	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Fledgling
Aha	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Ho hum
Rejected	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Accepted
Stop	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Go
Worthwhile	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Waste of time
Ambiguous	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Clear
Meaningful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Trite
Boring	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Exciting
Autonomous	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Integrated
Good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Bad
Dislike	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Like
Nuisance	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Asset

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS

Bright	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Dull
Indifferent	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Alert
Bored	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Interested
Quiet	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Energetic
Meticulous	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Messy
Verbal	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Non-verbal
Ugly	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Attractive
Athletic	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Clumsy
Self-starter	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Lazy
Dependant	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Independant
High Achiever	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Average
Loner	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Gregarious
Negative	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Positive

II. Characteristics of Gifted Students (Continued)

Milk-toast	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Opinionated
Extrovert	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Book-worm
Inquisitive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Accepting
Leader	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Follower
Non-creative	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Creative
Non-talented	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Talented
Fly-paper	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Aerosol Spray
One-tracked	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Versatile
WASP	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Minority
Obstinate	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Obedient
Middle Class	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Lower Class
Rich	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Poor
Cooperative	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Show off
Braggart	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Humble
Poor self-concept	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Good self-concept
Shy	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Self assured
Happy	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Sad
Unpopular	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Popular
Agreeable	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Combative
Failure	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Successful
Disagreeable	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Agreeable
Productive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Sterile
Quiet	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Loud
Charismatic	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Ordinary
Overbearing	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Withdrawn

III. COMMUNICATION
(Program Staff with School Staff)

Non-existant	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Frequent
Meaningful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Irrelevant
Interesting	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Dull
Inappropriate	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Informative
Time Consuming	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Concise
Confusing	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Clear
Useful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Useless
One way	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Two way
Open minded	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Dictatorial
Personal	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Nonpersonal
Ill-timed	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Timely

IV. CURRICULUM FOR THE GIFTED PROGRAM

Appropriate	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Inappropriate
Nebulous	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Well defined
Challenging	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Easy
Closed	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Open-ended
Static	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Dynamic
Disorganized	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Organized
Appealing	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Repelling
Passe'	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Timely
Varied	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Limited
Generalized	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Individualized
Stultifying	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Enriching
Original	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Repetitive
Self-paced	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Prescribed Paced
Teacher-centered	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Student-centered

IV. Curriculum for the Gifted Program (Continued)

Rejected	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Accepted
Indepth	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Superficial
Narrow	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Broad
Stretching	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Limiting
Staid	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Innovative
Multi-faceted	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	One-dimensional
Unnessary	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Necessary
Deflating	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Inspiring
"Unimode"	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Varied learning modes
Busy work	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Meaningful

THANK YOU FOR FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM

ANOVA SUMMARY TABLES

1. Elementary Level
2. Junior High Level
3. Senior High Level

Elementary Level

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM
BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	1,111.11	2.25
Error (S/A)	34	493.72	
Total	35		

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM
BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	1,260.25	2.38
Error (S/A)	34	529.43	
Total	35		

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM BY GROUPS AND TESTS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Between Ss	35		
Exp/Control (A)	1	2,369.00	2.83
Error (S/A)	34	838.66	
Within Ss	36		
Tests (B)	1	387.30	2.10
Exp/Control x Tests (AB)	1	2.40	0.01
Error (SB/A)	34	184.49	
Total	71		

Junior High Level

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	4,371.94	7.85*
Error (S/A)	48	556.96	
Total	49		

*$p \leq 0.01$

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM
BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	6,288.45	12.91*
Error (S/A)	48	487.16	
Total	49		

*$p \leq 0.01$

Senior High Level

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM
BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	926.82	2.38
Error (S/A)	47	390.02	
Total	48		

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFTED PROGRAM
BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	125.39	0.31
Error (S/A)	47	411.42	
Total	48		

APPENDIX C

CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS

ANOVA SUMMARY TABLES

1. Elementary Level
2. Junior High Level
3. Senior High Level

Elementary Level

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PRETEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	2,524.97	4.11*
Error (S/A)	32	614.22	
Total	33		

*$p \leq 0.10$

TABLE 25

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	116.74	0.36
Error (S/A)	32	322.40	
Total	33		

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS AND TESTS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Between Ss	33		
Exp/Control (A)	1	1,863.72	2.88
Error (S/A)	32	647.58	
Within Ss	34		
Tests (B)	1	0.52	0.00
Exp/Control x Tests (AB)	1	777.98	2.69
Error (SB/A)	32	289.05	
Total	67		

Junior High Level

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	405.44	0.44
Error (S/A)	48	916.83	
Total	49		

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	71.22	0.08
Error (S/A)	48	918.65	
Total	49		

Senior High Level

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	110.74	0.32
Error (S/A)	48	348.12	
Total	49		

TABLE 30

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTED STUDENTS BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	1.93	0.01
Error (S/A)	48	400.46	
Total	49		

APPENDIX D

COMMUNICATION (PROGRAM TO SCHOOL STAFF)

ANOVA SUMMARY TABLES

1. Elementary Level
2. Junior High Level
3. Senior High Level

Elementary Level

TABLE 31

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	83.33	0.37
Error (S/A)	28	227.85	
Total	29		

TABLE 32

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS AND TESTS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Between Ss	29		
Exp/Control (A)	1	464.82	1.47
Error (S/A)	28	315.95	
Within Ss	30		
Tests (B)	1	510.42	8.01*
Exp/Control x Tests (AB)	1	74.81	1.17
Error (SB/A)	28	63.72	
Total	59		

*$p \leq 0.05$

Junior High Level

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	690.83	6.94*
Error (S/A)	38	99.50	
Total	39		

*p ≤ 0.05

TABLE 34

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	1,480.23	11.34*
Error (S/A)	38	130.55	
Total	39		

*p ≤ 0.01

Senior High Level

TABLE 35

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION
BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	580.92	3.41*
Error (S/A)	48	170.58	
Total	49		

*$p \leq 0.10$

TABLE 36

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR
ATTITUDE TOWARD COMMUNICATION BY GROUPS
(SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	74.13	0.68
Error (S/A)	48	109.00	
Total	49		

APPENDIX E

CURRICULUM FOR THE GIFTED PROGRAM

ANOVA SUMMARY TABLES

1. Elementary Level
2. Junior High Level
3. Senior High Level

Elementary Level

TABLE 37

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (ELEMENTARY LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	16.53	0.02
Error (S/A)	30	699.65	
Total	31		

Junior High Level

TABLE 38

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	35,979.47	5.65*
Error (S/A)	38	633.54	
Total	39		

*$p \leq 0.05$

TABLE 39

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	7,686.53	12.20*
Error (S/A)	38	630.09	
Total	39		

*$p \leq 0.01$

Senior High Level

TABLE 40

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PRETEST SCORES FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS (SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	0.17	0.00
Error (S/A)	47	486.85	
Total	48		

TABLE 41

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES
FOR ATTITUDE TOWARD CURRICULUM BY GROUPS
(SENIOR HIGH LEVEL)

Source	df	MS	F
Exp/Control (A)	1	525.34	1.28
Error (S/A)	47	412.13	
Total	48		